



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

subsequent edition, the author would furnish full and accurate references to the works of many writers mentioned in the course of the discussion.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

Cornell University.

THE FAMILY. By Helen Bosanquet. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1906.

This book is a sociological study in which the ethical interest is clearly recognized throughout as the dominant interest. It is the history of an institution considered as embodying certain moral ideas. In tracing the development of the Family, in examining its various forms, and in tracing its relation with other institutions, Mrs. Bosanquet keeps unfalteringly the human point of view. The book is quite uncontroversial in tone, there is a total absence of polemic writing, but all the more striking on that account is its effect: for, by mere maintenance of a point of view which no one can deny to be the most important point of view, Mrs. Bosanquet gives us a most weighty criticism of, and a powerful antidote to, that wrong focusing of attention, whether economic or biological in character, which has obscured judgment on social problems for many years. The book is divided into two parts: The first part is historical. The Family is traced from the earliest times—"no race has been found in which it does not exist;" it is considered in relation to industry, to property, to the State. The second part treats of the Modern Family—its bases, economic function, its constituent parts, its outlook.

The writer is, as is fitting, in strong sympathy with her subject. "No people has advanced far in civilization in which it (the family) has not been highly organized and firmly knit together." If the Family comes together for the sake of life, it must remain together for the sake of good life. In its history we find it using Industry and Property as means for the development of its life, its unity, and its stability. We see family life in turn affected by the development of Industry and by changes of various kinds in the laws relating to Property. Of special interest in both these respects are the studies of the Patriarchal Family in Russia and in France, and of the feudal laws in France and in England. The Modern Family has, Mrs. Bosanquet maintains, "freed itself

both from the spiritual tyranny of ancestor-worship and the material tyranny of landed property, but has inherited and preserved the best traditions of both." "Its strength lies in the fact that in it we are attaining, on the one hand, to a higher knowledge of the true spiritual forces which bind the generations together, on the other to a better theory of material property. . . . The recognition of the fact that a more unfailing source of material prosperity lies in personal qualities than in either land or money, has enabled the Modern Family to maintain itself independently of inherited wealth," p. 336. "From time to time," says Mrs. Bosanquet, "the state has made strenuous efforts to mold the Family according to its needs; but ultimately the State itself must always be molded by the Family, since it is in the Family that the citizen is made." Family-life the nursery of good citizenship; personal quality the determining factor in social life; these are the two most frequently recurring notes in this admirable treatise: they form together its *leib-motiv*.

Of causes militating against family life at present, Mrs. Bosanquet finds that "personal defects of character stand, of course, preëminent," p. 338. She also finds "the Family failing and perverted: (1) Wherever the burden of maintaining it is transferred (to any great extent) from the strong members to the weak;" (2) "wherever there is an extensive reliance upon external sources of maintenance." "It is to this evasion of the responsibility which is the strength of the Family that we mainly owe the degenerate family-life which is characteristic of the worst, not necessarily the poorest, parts of our towns," p. 340, and wherever, as in large towns (3) there is "the habit of facile and superficial intercourse which grows up when people are herded together in very close quarters."

The book is not an exhaustive history of the Family, in all its various forms and stages, even so far as that history is to be found in all the varied writings and records of research on this subject. It does not even pretend to give to English readers a synopsis of that literature which exists—for the most part in German or French. Incidentally, much is done in both these directions. But the aim of the book is something different—it is "to bring together the materials for an estimate of the meaning and importance of the Family as an institution in human Society." This aim it very adequately realizes. With an easy, luminous style, ready but unobtrusive humor, and a warmth that grows into

eloquence, almost into passion towards its close, the book is in its fundamental attitude an admirable contribution on a most important subject.

MARY GILLILAND HUSBAND.

London.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION. A STUDY IN POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

By E. S. P. Haynes, late scholar of Balliol College, Oxford.

Issued for the Rationalist Press Association. London: Watts & Co., 1906. Second and Popular Edition, pp. 92.

Many interesting points are raised in this essay, and some interesting things are said, but there is a curious sense of inconclusiveness throughout and the conclusions reached are not convincing as an adequate account of the matter. This is partly due, no doubt, to the complexity of the subject, of which, to do him justice, it must be said that Mr. Haynes is quite conscious; and indeed this consciousness is one of the merits of the book, reinforced as it is by wide and alert reading. But the chief cause seems to lie in the omission to state clearly what is perhaps the greatest argument against persecution.

This is simply that it is not justifiable to punish men for doing what they think right, however mistaken, in the same spirit as we punish them for doing what they believe to be wrong. The battle for toleration is, in short, a battle for liberty of conscience as well as for liberty of thought. There is a passage at the end of the book that makes one inclined to say that Mr. Haynes has not only not stated this principle; he has not even grasped it. He contemplates, apparently, with equanimity, "the State occasionally inflicting small fines in the police court on priests who frighten sick persons with fears of hell, just as it now pursues this policy with women who make money by telling domestic servants their fortunes" (p. 85). But this comparison entirely misses the vital point: no one tells fortunes from a high sense of duty; while no one, except from such a sense, it may safely be said, preaches now or is likely ever to preach again the unpopular and terrible doctrine of hell.

To overlook this principle is to obscure the historic outlook. Mr. Haynes starts with pointing out, well and clearly, that the facile theory which makes toleration and skepticism stand and fall together cannot be right. "This would involve putting men